



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/890,696	12/16/2001	Michael Brock	MULLER-27	6217

7590 11/02/2006
C James Bushman
Browning Bushman
5718 Westheimer Suite 1800
Houston, TX 77057-5771

EXAMINER

WANG, SHENGJUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/890,696	BROCK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shengjun Wang	1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11-17 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-17 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of applicants' amendments and remarks submitted August 18, 2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 11-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lerg et al. (US 6,132,738, IDS) in view of Balzer (US 5,605,651) and Bergmann et al. (US 5,077,040), in further view of Ansmann et al. (EP 771,559), Scholz et al (DE 3534733, IDS) and applicants' admission

3. Lerg et al. teaches a cosmetic cleansing composition for shower comprising fatty alcohol ether sulfate alkanolammonium salt, or fatty alcohol sulfate alkanolammonium salt; an oil component, which may be triglycerides; a low alky alcohol, such as propylene glycol, and other well known cosmetic additives, including surfactant. See, particularly, the examples in columns 7 and 8. and the claims. Lerg et al. further teaches that it is considered within the skill of artisan to formulate various forms of oil containing composition, including oil-in-water emulsion, by using proper surfactant. See, particularly, column 1, lines 35-47. Lerg et al. point out that artisan is motivated to make concentrated form simply because concentrated form are convenient (compared to diluted, which would require large amounts when used). See, col. 2, lines 1-6.

Art Unit: 1617

4. Lerg et al. does not teach expressly a diluted form, i.e., with substantially amount of water, and in the form of microemulsion.

5. However, Balzer teaches that fatty alcohol ether sulfate alkanolammonium salt, or fatty alcohol sulfate alkanolammonium salt, are known to be an emulsifier, particularly, in cosmetic or pharmaceutical composition containing oil components. Bergmann et al. teaches that fatty alcohol ether sulfate alkanolammonium salt are known to be useful in cosmetic microemulsion compositions as surfactant. See, particularly, column 18, lines 34-60. Ansmann et al. disclose that diluted cosmetic or pharmaceutical emulsion with alkenyl(ether) sulphate (including alkanolamino salt) is known in the art. See, particularly pages 2-3 and the examples therein. Applicants admit "Microemulsions containing alkylpolyalkyleneglycolether-sulfates or alkylsulfates are known per se. DE 35 34 733 A1 discloses foaming surfactant preparations with clear-solubilized, water-insoluble oil components, which are usually termed microemulsions." (page 4, line 20-24 of the specification). DE 35 34 733 A1 discloses composition contains (A) 0.05-3wt.% of a clear solubilised, water insoluble oil, fat or wax, (B) 0.5-30% of a non-ionic polyoxyethylated emulsifier, (C) 10-30% of an anionic sulph(on)ate surfactant, (D) 0-10% of an amphoteric and/or hybrid ionic and/or amine oxide surfactant, and (E) 40-80% of water. (see page 1).

6. Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to dilute the composition of Lerg et al. with water and formulate the composition into microemulsion form accordingly.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to dilute the composition of Lerg et al. with water and formulate the composition into microemulsion form because fatty alcohol

Art Unit: 1617

ether sulfate alkanolammonium salts, or fatty alcohol sulfate alkanolammonium salts are known to be useful as emulsifier, and are particularly useful in microemulsion cosmetic composition. It is noted that diluted cosmetic or pharmaceutical emulsion with alkenyl(ether) sulphate (including alkanolamino salt) is known in the art. Furthermore, the optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., particularly surfactant, or the amounts of each and every ingredient, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, In re Boesch and Slaney (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215. With respect to hydroxylisopropyl as R4, note Lerg disclose ammonium salt wherein Rs may be hydroxyl alkyl radical having from 1-24 carbon (column 2, lines 55-67), and Balzer particularly teaches the ammonium salt of fatty alcohol sulfate with C2-C3 alkanolammonium (column 3, lines 54-60). Further, a known or obvious composition does not become patentable simply because it has been described as somewhat inferior to some other product for the same use." In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551, 554, 31 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1994). A diluted forms of a known cosmetic or pharmaceutical composition, even though known to be inferior (for its inconvenience), is deemed obvious to its concentrated form, and is not patentable distinct from the known concentrated form. As to claim 20 which recites "constisting essentially of", note Lerg et al. do not require other ingredient as the essential material in the composition. As to the limitation "being optical transparent", which define a physical property of the composition, note A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches or suggest the identical chemical structure, the properties Applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990. See MPEP 2112.01. The burden is shifted to Applicant to show that the prior art product does not possess the same properties as instantly claimed product.

7. Claims 11-17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hermann et al. (US 4,371,548, IDS) in view of Balzer (US 5,605,651) and Bergmann et al. (US 5,077,040), and in further view of Ansmann et al. (EP 771,559).
8. Hermann et al. teaches a cosmetic cleansing composition for shower comprising fatty alcohol ether sulfate, or fatty alcohol sulfate; and polyalkanolamine, such as isopropanolamine or diisopropanolamine; an oil component, which may be triglycerides; a low alky alcohol, such as propylene glycol, and other well known cosmetic additives, including surfactant. See, particularly, column 1, line 35 bridging column 2, line 24, the examples in columns 3 and 4, and the claims.
9. Hermann et al. does not teach expressly a diluted form, i.e., with substantially amount of water, and in the form of microemulsion.
10. However, Balzer teaches that fatty alcohol ether sulfate alkanolammonium salt, or fatty alcohol sulfate alkanolammonium salt, are known to be an emulsifier, particularly, in cosmetic or pharmaceutical composition containing oil components. Bergmann et al. teaches that fatty alcohol ether sulfate alkanolammonium salt are known to be useful in cosmetic microemulsion compositions as surfactant. See, particularly, column 18, lines 34-60. Ansmann et al. disclose that diluted cosmetic or pharmaceutical emulsion with alkenyl(ether) sulphate (including alkanolamino salt) is known in the art. See, particularly pages 2-3 and the examples therein. Applicants admit that "Microemulsions containing alkylpolyalkyleneglycolether-sulfates or alkylsulfates are known per se. DE 35 34 733 A1 discloses foaming surfactant preparations with

Art Unit: 1617

clear-solubilized, water-insoluble oil components, which are usually termed microemulsions.” (page 4, line 20-24 of the specification). DE 35 34 733 A1 discloses composition contains (A) 0.05-3wt.% of a clear solubilised, water insoluble oil, fat or wax, (B) 0.5-30% of a non-ionic polyoxyethylated emulsifier, (C) 10-30% of an anionic sulph(on)ate surfactant, (D) 0-10% of an amphoteric and/or hybrid ionic and/or amine oxide surfactant, and (E) 40-80% of water. (see page 1).

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to dilute the composition of Hermann et al. with water and formulate the composition into microemulsion form accordingly.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to dilute the composition of Lerg et al. with water and formulate the composition into microemulsion form because fatty alcohol ether sulfate alkanolammonium salts, or fatty alcohol sulfate alkanolammonium salts are known to be useful as emulsifier, and are particularly useful in microemulsion cosmetic composition.

Further, it is noted that diluted cosmetic or pharmaceutical emulsion with alkenyl(ether) sulphate (including alkanolamino salt) is known in the art. Furthermore, the optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., particularly surfactant, or the amounts of each and every ingredient, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, In re Boesch and Slaney (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215.

With respect to hydroxylisopropyl as R4, note Hermann disclose the amine moiety of the ammonium salt may be isopropanolamine, mixed alkanolalkylamines, and Balzer particularly teaches the ammonium salt of fatty alcohol sulfate with C2-C3 alkanolammonium. A known or obvious composition does not become patentable simply because it has been described as somewhat inferior to some other product for the same use." In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551, 554, 31

Art Unit: 1617

USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1994). A diluted forms of a known cosmetic or pharmaceutical composition, even though known to be inferior (for its inconvenience), is deemed obvious to its concentrated form, and is not patentable distinct from the known concentrated form. As to claim 20, which recites "consisting essentially of", note Hermann et al. do not require other ingredient as the essential material in the composition. As to the limitation "being optical transparent", which define a physical property of the composition, note A chemical composition and its properties are inseparable. Therefore, if the prior art teaches or suggest the identical chemical structure, the properties Applicant discloses and/or claims are necessarily present. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990. See MPEP 2112.01. The burden is shifted to Applicant to show that the prior art product does not possess the same properties as instantly claimed product.

Response to the Arguments

Applicants' amendments and remarks submitted August 18, 2006 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive.

11. As to the rejections over Lerg et al. in view of Balzer and Bergmann et al., in further view of Ansmann et al. Scholz et al and applicants' admission, applicants assert that there is simply no motivation to one or ordinary skill in the art for dilute the bathing composition of Lerg. The arguments are unpersuasive. Lerg et al. disclose that it is considered within the skill of artisan to formulate various forms of oil containing composition, including oil-in-water emulsion, by using proper surfactant. See, particularly, column 1, lines 35-47. Lerg et al. point out that artisan is motivated to make concentrated form simply because concentrated form are

Art Unit: 1617

convenient (compared to diluted, which would require large amounts when used). See, col. 2, lines 1-6. Further, bathing composition is supposed to be used with water. As Lerg et al. disclosed, the advantage of concentrated bathing composition is merely for its convenient for handling, but provide no superiority as to the cleansing properties, and diluted forms for bathing composition is known in the art. The claimed invention herein, read on the diluted form of the bathing composition, and are deemed to be an obvious variation of Lerg's composition.

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

Art Unit: 1617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SHENGJUNWANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Shengjun Wang
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617